REMARKS

The foregoing amendment amends Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23 and 24, and adds Claims 25 and 26. Now in the application are Claims 1-26 of which Claims 1, 12, 23 and 24 are independent. No new matter has been added.

Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to clarify that the invention deals with enabling a user to indicate a value only once to set multiple network objects for different device types. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and at least at page 6, lines 24-26.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garvey et al. (5774667) (hereinafter "Garvey"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-11

Amended Claim 1 is independent and Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1. As Claims 2-11 depend from amended Claim 1, they incorporate each and every element of amended Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method is directed to "providing a user interface that enables the user to indicate a first value for which to set a plurality of network objects representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types by specifying the first value only once and initiating setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of different network device types equal to the first value."

Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1-11, as amended. Specifically, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of different network device types equal to the first value.

Garvey discusses using a set of graphical user interface cues that allow multiple instances of the same type of network device to be set up simultaneously with the same windows used to set up a single network device, (Garvey, Col. 5, lines 46-50). The ability of setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing one or more portions of a plurality of

different network device types equal to the indicated value is not disclosed by Garvey. Garvey discloses simultaneously editing several same type network objects on several <u>same type</u> network devices, (Garvey, Col. 6, lines 33-37). In contrast, the present application is directed to setting a value of multiple network objects representing multiple *different network device types*.

Furthermore, Garvey teaches away from the claimed invention. Garvey teaches modifying the same type of network objects representing the same type of network devices. That is, after selecting the same type of network objects, Garvey teaches displaying the attributes of the objects in a window. The window displays one specific layout illustrating the attributes of the selected type of network objects, see Figure 13 of Garvey. Therefore, in Garvey, the user has to choose the same type of network devices that will have the same layout of attributes. However, the present invention discloses a user interface that enables a user to set the attributes of different types of network objects representing different types of network devices. See Fig. 5 of the instant application. That is, in accordance with the teachings of the present invention, the user can choose multiple different types of network objects representing multiple different types of network devices and modify one or more attributes at the same time.

The present invention allows the users to select multiple network objects from multiple different network device types to set the values of the network objects. According to Claim 1, the user indicates a value only once, and the selected network objects representing multiple different device types are set to the indicated value. In Garvey, the user can only simultaneously configure the same type of network devices. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1-11, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claims passed to allowance.

<u>Claims 12-22</u>

Amended claim 12 is independent and Claims 13-22 depend from Claim 12. As claims 12-22 depend from amended Claim 12, they incorporate each and every element of amended Claim 12. Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the system is directed to "a user interface to enable the user to indicate a first value for which to set the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* by specifying

the first value only once" and "a message component to initiate setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* equal to the first value."

Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 12-22, as amended. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 12-22, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claims passed to allowance.

Claim 23

Independent Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the medium holds instructions directed to "a user interface to enable the user to indicate a first value for which to set the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* by specifying the first value only once" and "initiating setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* equal to the first value."

Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 23, as amended. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 23, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claim passed to allowance.

Claim 24

Independent Claim 24 has been amended to clarify that the system is directed to "means for enabling the user to indicate a first value for which to set the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* by specifying

the first value only once" and "a message component to initiate setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* equal to the first value."

Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 24, as amended. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing one or more portions of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 24, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claim passed to allowance.

New Claims

Claims 25 and 26 have been added to more fully appreciate the Applicants' claimed invention. Claim 25 is dependent on claim 2, and thus, incorporates all the patentable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 26 is dependent on claim 13, and thus, incorporates all the patentable subject matter of claim 13. None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest the first network device being *a different network device* than the second network device.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25 and 26 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this statement. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. ENB-008 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: March 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _David R. Burns_
David R. Burns
Registration No.: 46,590
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant